DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 883 FL 003 221

AUTHOR Jakobovits, Leon A.
TITLE The Encounter-Communication Workshop.
PUB DATE Jun 70
NOTE 47p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Biculturalism; *Bilingual Education; Bilingual Teachers; Cultural Awareness; Cultural Differences; Cultural Interrelationships; Cultural Pluralism; *Individual Development; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Minority Groups; Non English Speaking; Personality Development; Role Perception; Self Actualization; Social Psychology; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This paper outlines a program of inservice training for teachers and administrative school personnel designed to foster a better understanding of the problems involved in the education of children from minority groups within an educational system that is defined and administered by the cultural interests of the dominant social or national community. The Encounter-Communication Workshop, a program of study conducted in small groups in the bilingual school setting, is designed to give the individual a better understanding of himself within the context of interpersonal communication. The study program involves two types of activities: an objective analysis of role dyadic interactions in the school in terms of a linguistic-communication model, and an analysis of the subjective aspects of interpersonal relations, including social contracts, trust, risk-taking, self-image and its management, and personal metaphysics. Included in these activities are an initial diagnosis of the prevalent modes of personal interaction in the particular school setting and action programs designed to introduce changes coupled with constant feedback and evaluation of the results. (Author/RL)

ED 062 883

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

June, 1970

The Encounter-Communication Workshop

Leon A. Jakobovits

University of Illinois, Champaign

and

McGill University, Montreal

ED 062 883

FL 003 281

Abstract

The encounter-communication workshop is a program of study conducted in small groups and is designed to give the individual a better understanding of himself within the context of interpersonal communication. In the bilingual school setting, it takes the form of in-service training for teachers and other administrative personnel , who meet regularly throughout the academic year, exploring under the guidance of a program director ways of transforming the bilingual school into a bicultural school, in which the emphasis shifts from bilingual education per se to bicultural communication. The study program involves two types of activities: an objective analysis of role dyadic interactions in the school in terms of a linguistic-communication model, and an analysis of the subjective aspects of interpersonal relations, including social contracts, trust, risk-taking, self image and its management, and personal metaphysics. Included in these activities are, an initial diagnosis of the prevalent modes of personal interaction in the

particular school setting, and action programs designed to introduce changes in them coupled with constant feedback and evaluation of the results. The encounter-communication workshop is not slated to be either "psychotherapy" or a "How to"course in interpersonal communication. It is not slated to be either a sensitivity training laboratory or a basic encounter group. Neither is it a traditional academic training program. It does, however, have some affinity with both these types of undertakings. For instance, although much attention is spent on analyses of the communication process within the technical framework of academic disciplines such as linguistics, psychology, and anthropology, the interpersonal context and social climate of the study group is personal and intimate, mirroring certain aspects of the sensitivity training labcratory. Because of this, special care must be taken on the part of the principal, not only to explicitly state the voluntary nature of such a program, but also to insure that school personnel do not feel in any way under pressure to participate. In some instances, individuals in a job setting may be hesitant to decline to participate in a "voluntary" program set up by their superiors "for their benefit". It is the responsibility of the principal and the program director to see to it that such subtle pressures do not in fact exist in connection with an encounter-communication workshop, both vis-à-vis initial participation and eventual completion. The lack of free and voluntary choice with full awareness of the nature of the workshop undermines its very goals, and, in additon, constitutes unethical duress and an infringement upon individual freedom.

Prior to making a decision about participation in an encounter-communication workshop, it is incumbent upon the individual to clearly understand "what it is all about" and "what he is getting himself into". This is achieved by reading a description of the program as outlined, for instance, in this article, by familiarizing himself to some degree with the readings suggested herein, and by an exploratory face-to-face interview with the program director. These cautions are expressed here both for the sake of the prospective participants, and for the sake of the program's success.

The Encounter-Communication Workshop

Leon A. Jakobovits

University of Illinois, Champaign

and

McGill University, Montreal

Introduction

This paper outlines a program of in-service training for teachers and administrative school personnel, which is designed to foster a better understanding of the problems involved in the education of children from minority groups within an educational system that is defined and administered by the cultural interests of the dominant social or national community. Most parts of the world are faced with this situation, to a lesser or major extent, inasmuch as linguistic and cultural pluralism is a more usual pattern of nationhood than uniculturalism. In the United States, the region which constitutes the socio-cultural focus of this proposed training program, major viable and dynamic linguistic/cultural minorities exist, the most notable being the Black ghetto of the inner city in large metropolitan areas, the Mexican Americans in the Southwest, the Puerto Rican population in New York, the Cuban immigrants in Miami City, and the various Amerindian groups throughout the North American continent.

In the last decade or so, we have witnessed a major upsurge of militant expression on the part of linguistic/cultural minority Americans, Afro-, Mexican-, Puerto Rican-, and Indian,

giving us such slogans as Black Power and Red Power. While there are many obvious differences that distinguish the history and context of these various movements, they all share the common characteristic of being attempts at cultural revival and assertion in the face of a long history of repression and assimilation on the part of the dominant middle class, white Anglo-Saxon culture.

One of the most important social devices used by a dominant culture in its attempt to acculturate and assimilate minority groups is, of course, the formal educational system represented by the schools. Teachers thus constitute primary agents, not only of socialization in the enculturation process of the children of the culturally dominant group, but also of the acculturation process of the children of the cultural minority groups. Teachers, therefore, given the role that society relegates them to, as the transmitters of the dominant cultural values, tend to be conservative, and in the face of challenge by militants of minority groups, they become in effect reactionary agents, standing in the way of liberation from perceived cultural repression.

In the context of cultural conflict,the school becomes a battle field reflecting the social reality of the community, and the teacher becomes the focus of opposing forces. To members of minorty groups, the teacher has become a symbol of repression, an enemy to be feared and mistrusted, and the school, an alien place to be left as soon as the law permits. Small wonder, then, that up to 80% of minority group children are high school dropouts. The vicious cycle of the economically underprivileged is thus perpetuated generation after

generation, continuing to undermine the stability of society as a whole. The very institution that is supposed to establish and maintain stability and order in society thus becomes a barrier to them.

It is only recently that some awareness of the process just described has become widespread in American society, but it has already resulted in some very important changes in policy on the part of government and the educational establishment. The Bilingual Education Act under Title VII has fostered, in the past two years, the development of dozens of experimental programs throughout the country, representing a new recognition of the necessity of legitimatizing the aspirations of minority groups for the maintenance of their cultural heritage. The psychological climate in many schools in the Southwest that have large groups of Spanish-speaking children has changed from linguistic repression on the playground to, at least, linguistic tolerance, if not yet wholehearted approval.

Despite these visible signs of change, however, it cannot be said that the problems have been solved, or even, that the wheels have been set in motion for their eventual solution. For instance, graduates of the largest and oldest bilingual elementary school in the country, that of Coral Way School in Dade County, Miami, overwhelmingly choose not to continue bilingual education in Junior High School, despite the availability of such a program (Beebe,1970). Furthermore, despite a burgeoning of research in a new vein on the part of linguists ---sociolinguists---, which shows how simplistic and uninformed teachers' conception is of Black English, there remains an apparently unshakeable conviction that it is an inferior mode of

communication, unsuitable for the expression of ideas involved in school subjects (Bereiter and Engleman,1966; Kochman,1969). There is taking place in educational circles a subtle but insidious shift from racial to ethnic prejudice, away from the Black man's biological entity, to his social entity, his language and culture. Prejudicial shifts of no less virulent form are to be expected in the case of the Mexican Americans and the Puerto Ricans, away from an outright linguistic repression, to cultural aspects of the individual's integrity, (cf. "They are a good and simple people; they like flowers and dancing; they are not ambitious for making money.",etc.)

We are dealing here with nothing less than outright ethnic prejudice in the traditional forms of American ethnocentrism. There is no evidence that a fundamental change has taken place in the melting pot policy of promoting The American Way of Life. There is no evidence that the educational establishment is ready to abdicate its role as an agent of assimilation for the dominant middle class, white Anglo-Saxon culture. The American ideal of "equal opportunity for all" still presupposes the unstated condition, "for all who are willing and capable of becoming good Americans first". The recent Bilingual Education Act, the very symbol of a new attitude of tolerance toward cultural minorities, may, within the context of the old climate of ethnocentrism, become one more tool in the arsenal of an assimilatory agency. The Title VII program explicitly affirms the primary importance of English, and its main justification is the hope that it might help to prevent retardation in school performance. The current objectives of

the American school system remain the same. Nowhere is the possibility raised that the various cultural minorities in the United States may have different objectives for an educational system. The possibility of allowing these cultural groups to define and evolve their own educational objectives is nowhere raised. And yet, it is doubtful that anything short of this can sustain a viable, dynamic culture and restore dignity to millions of "aliens" and alienated people in this country. For, just as the survival and evolution of the dominant American culture depends in large measure on its educational institutions, so does the survival of the Afro-American, Mexican American and Amerindian cultures depend on educational institutions designed by them and for them within their cultural premises.

Until such time as the minority cultures gain sufficient political freedom to implement and evolve their own educational objectives, the concept of the bilingual school remains the least destructive alternative within the present sociopolitical reality. The problem that faces us in this endeavor is, how can we evolve the bilingual school into a bicultural school? Whatever Congress and educational administrators might say or do about this problem, its solution ultimately lies with the teacher and what he does in the classroom. A bicultural policy is a set of directives on pieces of paper, or something one makes speeches about, but it isn't a bicultural school. A bicultural school that is so in fact, rather than in policy, is a place where certain forms of communication take place between teacher and pupil. The characteristics of these bi-

cultural forms of communication are different from those in a unilingual school or a unicultural bilingual school. To bring about the reality of a bicultural school, the teacher must know what these particular characteristics are, understand them in a perscnal and intimate way, and must, furthermore, consider them intrinsically valuable for himself, as well as for his pupils. To know them intellectually is not sufficient; he must want them, desire them, as a personal goal in life, as an enrichment of his self. To achieve bicultural communication, an individual must become a bicultural person. This goes for both the teacher and the pupil.

It should be noted at this point, that bilingualism is not the issue here. Our conception of the ideal bilingual overlaps with biculturalism, true, but, which comes first, bilingualism or biculturalism? It isn't useful to phrase the problem in these divisive terms, for the two processes are interrelated in their etiology. Research in this area, (e.g. Lambert,1967), suggests that a precondition for the development of ideal bilinguism is an "integrative" orientation toward the second culture on the part of the learner. Similarly, for bicultural communication to develop, there must exist on the part of the interactants a prior attitude of mutual acceptance, respect and a feeling that the other's culture is worthwhile to acquire as one's own.

As is the case with bilingual performance, the end product, that of achieving the truly bicultural status, is not the issue, but rather the psychological climate that is favorable for its development and occurence, for bicultural communication can

take place in the absence of either perfect bilingualism or perfect biculturalism. For instance, as the unilingual, unicultural Spanish-speaking child enters first grade, taught by a bilingual or semi-bilingual American teacher, a cultural confrontation takes place in the classroom. For meaningful communication to develop between them, that confrontation must be transformed into an encounter. The pupil must want to become more "like the teacher", and the teacher must want to become more "like the pupil". As the weeks and months go by, they learn from each other and they grow together, each of them becoming more than what he was before. They now belong, in greater or lesser extent, to two cultures, even though neither of them may ever be perfectly bilingual or perfectly bicultural. This is the context of bicultural communication we must strive for in the bilingual school.

Cultural Confrontation vs. Encounter

Cultures in contact may be in a state of confrontation as in Canada, Belgium, or India, or they may be in a state of encounter, as was the case in ancient Rome after the conquest of Greece, or is today the case in Finland, in Switzerland, in Israel, or in Japan. What is the difference?

Confrontation implies competition; encounter implies cooperation. In a competitive relationship, what one wins, the other loses; in a cooperative relationship, both are winners and there are no losers. When two people interact, each of them must take certain personal risks: to address someone

may mean a rebuff through the other's silence; to ask a favor may mean refusal; to reveal an attitude may mean condemnation; and so on. When the interlocutor isn't trusted, as is the case in confrontation or competition, one doesn't like to take many or significant risks; one must remain shielded and guarded. When the other is trusted, one can afford to take risks, to open up, to communicate, to encounter, to cooperate.

What leads to mutual trust?

The "safest" atmosphere is that in which the one values and admires the other, and proves it by wanting to become like the other, the culturally integrative orientation. There is no way of faking this process by paying lip service to the other's "right to be different"; the diplomatic subterfuge is quickly discovered; it can be felt like a brick wall. No significant risk-taking will be attempted; no encounter, and no real communication.

Most of us have experienced at some time or other in our lives, the process of encountering someone, although in a competitive society such as ours, that wonderful experience is rare and the instances few and far between. We must search our memories way back, into early childhood, to recapture that taste of trust, safety, and freedom. As socialized adults, we have learned to be discreet, polite,cautious, self-reliant, strong, ambitious, successful, mature, outer-directed, task-involved, autonomous, dutiful, and of course, repressed, guarded, secretive, isolated and alienated from each other.

Though our memory of the encounter process be distant, our longing for it remains strong and immediate. People throughout

the country, of all ages and walks of life, have begun to form small artificial groups, in an attempt to get back together again. What distinguishes these basic encounter or sensitivity groups from natural groups as the family and the social party, neighborhood, or church group, is the recognition of why they are there, and the members' agreement to attempt to interrelate by means of a new social contract: cooperation instead of competition, at the personal feeling level. Differences in feeling and attitude are not just tolerated or politely "respected" --- in fact, they are frequently challenged, sometimes vigorously rejected, but the members commit themselves to protect each other's selfhood, to feel for each other, to make the other person's pain one's own, so that, should one make the other suffer, he will be causing his own suffering, and should he give pleasure to the other, he will contribute to his own delight; in short, to encounter rather than confront.

To contemplate the encountering way of life can be quite threatening to most of us. Is it really possible? Isn't it dangerous? It may even be immoral! Isn't it subversive to our American ideals? Won't it destroy ambition, the will to conquer nature, individuality, the very strongholds of a free, enterprising and entrepreneuring, economic, technological society that has brought us the highest standard of living in the world? With all this free talk of "love", what should happen to the blood ties of the family, the sacred bond of marriage, the pride in one's nation, the right to maintain and preserve the "interesting and valuable" differences among "foreign peoples" of the world?

To most people who join encounter-sensitivity groups, these

philosophical and moral issues seem irrelevant, and even distasteful, a smoke screen of "head tripping" to prevent one from getting "down to the feeling level". At present, the members of encounter groups are a very distinct, self-selected group of people; they form a counter-culture to the main stream of American society. They are "odd balls" culturally even though significant numerically. Yet the message they sound finds a nostalgic echo in the longing of most of us, in our pursuit of greater happiness, human fellowship, and personal integrity. Increasing numbers of thoughtful and concerned people have come to believe that we cannot afford, we do not wish to, reject outright the possibility of a better, more rewarding way of life. We must examine this possibility and explore it <u>on our own terms</u>. This is the purpose of the encounter-communication workshop, and in the present context, it focuses on bicultural communication in the school.

The encounter-communication workshop (henceforth ECW) is the entry of the "squares" into an area of endeavor hitherto claimed as the exclusive property of the "With it Generation". It is "head tripping cum feeling", and begins where the others have left off. The members of an encounter group are psychologically committed to its goals before they join; the persons who join an ECW are only committed to examine and explore these goals. How does it work?

The Structure of ECW

An ECW program centers around two types of activities: A. a communication analysis of the setting, coupled with an action program that introduces corrective measures in interpersonal behavior; B. basic encounter experiences that explore and monitor the subjective psychological concomitants of the action program. The first type of activity is objectively analytical and is oriented toward overt actions. The second type of activity is subjectively analytical (not necessarily in the psychoanalytical sense) and is oriented toward inner feelings and attitudes. It is not "psychotherapy" in that it is not designed to bring about psychological change or reprieve from anxiety and "psychological problems". Rather, it is "honest psychological talk among lay equals", the kind of interchange that may take place between intimate friends. It is both analytically explorative and mutually succoring.

Most of the interchange in an ECW program takes place in small group sessions (8- 12 people) held periodically throughout the academic year, under the direction of the program leader. These special sessions, each of which may last for several hours of intensive interaction, are held in the context of the day to day routine of the teacher's work and the various ongoing action programs attempted in connection with the ECW program. We shall now examine in greater detail the nature of these two activities.

A. The Communication Pattern of the Setting

A preliminary analysis of a communicative interaction leads one to specify certain abstract conceptual elements of the following sort. A message which constitutes the content of the communication, the information that is being transmitted by the sender or source; the intended receiver of the message or the destination; and the code in which the message is contained (e.g. English). The message is encoded at or by the source, is transmitted through a medium or channel (e.g. sound waves) and is decoded at or by the receiver or destination. This communication cycle involves processes of transformation at various points: the encoding process transforms thoughts and intentions, which are mental phenomena, into physical manifestations such as speech sounds that are structured according to the system of rules of the code (language); similarly, the decoding process transforms the coded message back into mental phenomena, through a process of syntactic, semantic, and other kinds of analyses.

There are different types of transformation processes, each having different characteristics. We shall be concerned in this discussion mostly with functional transformations rather than physical; the latter focus on such things as the relation between brain patterned discharge and articulatory speech movements, between articulatory speech movements and spectographic electric patterns, etc. Functional transformations focus on the equivalence relation of patterns irrespective of their physical constituents, such as , for instance,

the relation between thought and word, between intended meaning and received meaning, between abstract grammatical elements (noun, verb, morpheme, subject, object, etc.) and concrete phonological ones (sequence of words, sentences), and so on.

The essence of a communication analysis lies in a specification of the nature and character of its various transformation processes. All transformations can, in principle, be described and specified by a set of rules called a <u>generative system</u>. For instance, the transformation of the set of objects, flour, water, yeast, salt, etc. into "bread" can be specified by a generative set of rules, a "recipe", which when applied or followed step by step, will yield the object in question. Similarly, the particular object known as a "sentence of English" can be generated by following a complex series of steps or rules specified by a "grammar", some of which will be transformational.

The analysis of a complex activity, such as human communication, into transformations is an abstraction, a convenient fiction designed to help us specify the activity in as much detail as possible. It allows us to make certain explicit hypotheses about how a process <u>might</u> take place so that we can test them against certain empirical consequences. Let us, to begin with, examine the following hypothetical interchange and see the kinds of processes that might be involved in ordinary, everyday communication:

Daughter: Jimmy is here!

Mother: You haven't cleaned up your room.

Daughter: We still have to pick up Donna.

Mother: Mother is coming. And I still have to shop for some groceries.

Daughter: She'll understand. Besides, she isn't that well organized herself.

Mother: But you promised!

Daughter: Oh, but you don't understand! Last time, he got very mad, because traffic is so heavy at this time of the day.

Mother: Oh, he is such a finicky! What's wrong with Steve, anyway? He is so much nicer.

Daughter: He doesn't like Bernie.

Mother: I thought Donna was going with Archie?

Daughter: The Redmen are playing at Queen's this weekend.

Mother: Mother will never understand. I'll have to speak to Dad again.

Daughter: Oh, all right! I'll make my bed, but you do the rest.

Mother: All right. Hurry up!

Ordinary conversation is highly elliptical. To understand this interchange, we must supply a great deal of information that is <u>implicit</u>. Some of this information is culturally available, and some of it is situation specific. For instance, Mother's concern is understandable only if we know the critical attitude which a mother-in-law can have vis-à-vis her son's wife, and the anxiety on the latter's part about making a good impression. Furthermore, we must be aware that granddaughters do not share this concern, but they in turn are much more anxious about how their boyfriends feel, a concern not generally reciprocated by mothers. In addition, we could guess

that cleaning up one's room has been a chronic problem in this family and that Mother has some leverage on Daughter by threatening to complain to Dad, the disciplinarian with whom Daughter would rather avoid another clash. Other aspects of this interchange need situation specific information to make them understandable. For instance, we must know that Steve is another boy with whom Daughter has gone out in the past; that Bernie is a substitute for Archie, the latter being Donna's regular boyfriend; that Archie is a football player with the Redmen, and so on. All this remains unstated and implicit, since Mother and Daughter share a common background experience and knowledge, and there is no need to state these facts. They are "understood".

In addition to sharing background knowledge, both cultural and situation specific, the interactants have in common certain background expectations, and engage in certain specific sorts of reasoning, largely inferential. For instance, Daughter knows that Mother expects her to help in house cleaning chores, especially at a time of crises (e.g. when mother-in-law shows up). Mother knows that Daughter expects her to ease up on her house cleaning demands when Daughter finds herself in a crisis situation (e.g. grouchy Jimmy is waiting). These are unstated background expectations that regulate their interaction and without which each person's appeal wouldn't make sense: "Jimmy is here!" (therefore you can't expect me to keep my promise to clean up the room); "Mother is coming!" (therefore you are supposed to drop everything to help me straighten up the house). Both interactants must in addition engage in inferential

reasoning that is peculiar and appropriate to the nature of the particular communication act in progress. For instance, someone who isn't organized herself can't be critical of others for being like they are... so, "She'll understand." Note that this kind of "can't" isn't a physical impossibility, or even a logical one, but more like an injunction that she "ought not". On the other hand, the fact that Donna is going with Bernie rather than Archie ("The Redmen are playing at Queen's this weekend.") is to be deduced on logical premises, given the knowledge that (a) Archie plays for the Redmen and (b) the Redmen are away at Queen's --- ergo Archie can't take Donna out.

Thus, to understand the process of commonplace, everyday communication, our analysis will have to deal with implicit, unstated information of a cultural and situation specific sort, with shared background expectations, and with several types of inferential reasoning. But this is just the beginning. Why do Mother and Daughter have a disagreement in the first place? How is the disagreement resolved and why is the half-way solution acceptable to both parties? What else goes on between Mother and Daughter, besides the overt argument about cleaning up the room? (cf. "But you promised!" and "What's wrong with Steve, anyway?").

To resolve these issues we must widen our circle of analysis to take in psychological factors such as Mother's and Daughter's personalities, their needs, ambitions, values, conflicts, social psychological factors such as the family's socio-economic status and religious affiliation, their conception of the role of parent, boyfriend, mother-in-law,and their

conception of social institutions such as the family and marriage, and of social practices such as dating; and, ultimately, moral and philosophical premises within which all the previous factors are embedded.

Put in this context, a full analysis of even the simplest communication interchange is a quite formidable undertaking. And yet, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that some such analysis, of at least this complexity, is made by an individual in everyday life, in commonplace communicative acts, otherwise he could not engage in successful communication. But, of course, the analysis is done "unconsciously", automatically, effortlessly, and it becomes prohibitive only when we attempt to make explicit all the steps that make up this complex human activity. A child of four or five has developed and internalized an extremely complex system of rules we call "grammar" that enables him to produce and understand an infinite number of grammatical sentences. This knowledge is almost totally unconscious and is arrived at seemingly effortlessly, naturally. And yet, thousands of intelligent and technologically skilled linguists are unable to describe this knowledge in an explicit sense, after many, many years of hard work, and may not ever be able to do so.

In that case, why bother with the attempt? Speaking from a practical point of view, there is a great deal to be gained from explicit descriptions of implicit or unconscious processes, even though these descriptions remain partial and incomplete. Consider the technological achievements made possible by an incomplete, partial, and even internally contradictory descrip-

tion of the physical universe. We do not need to have a complete description of communication processes in order to be able to either improve their quality or control them in some ways. It is likely, however, that the better, more valid, and more complete our description is, the better our chances will be to affect them in ways we deem advantageous. This is the motivation and the anticipated pay-off for doing the kind of analytic activity we discussed.

In an undertaking such as this, there are various strategies we can follow to maximize our chances of success in the solution of certain problems. Since we are very much concerned here with cross-cultural communication, we want to focus our attention on those factors that both facilitate and hinder the effectiveness of communication in that kind of setting. No serious attempt at solving this problem can be made within the confines of this paper, but it might be useful to sketch out a strategy.

The structure within which the analysis is to be made has already been presented in the previous discussion. Thus, we shall be concerned, among other things, with identifying differences in background expectations and communicative inferential reasoning between the interactants that are both senders and receivers of messages, paying particular attention to the various transformations that occur and in the process of which, information is lost or intention misinterpreted.

Background expectations, particularly those that are culturally defined, tend to form clusters, such that given expectations r, s, t, it is more likely to find expectations u, v, w, to co-occur in that cluster, than, say, a, b, c. For instance,

given that the receiver is an adult male, he is more likely to respond favorably to a request such as, "Pardon me, do you have a match?", when accosted by a stranger on the street. Similarly, a pupil in the lower grades may make of the teacher a request that he be allowed to go to the toilet, which he would not make of his parent at home or a stranger on the street. Or again, a school principal's comment on the teacher's behavior in the classroom has different import for her than a similar comment addressed to her by a pupil, fellow teacher, or assistant teacher. These clusters of expectations form what we call role behavior and this is to an extent culturally defined. Every communicative interaction between two people, which we shall call a communicative dyad , or simply dyad, is conditioned to a greater or lesser degree by these socially defined role behaviors. In other words, every communicative act is to some extent a role dyadic interaction.

One source of noise (misunderstanding, misinterpretation) in a role-dyadic interaction lies in differences in role expectations (or role conceptions) between the two members of the dyad. Consider the following interchange:

Teacher: Johnny doesn't seem to respond to any form of punishment I administer in the classroom.

Father: I can't understand that. At home, he doesn't dare disobey me.

Johnny happens to respond extremely well to physical punishment. Father's puzzlement comes about through the fact that he misunderstands the teacher's reference to "any form of punishment I administer", failing to realize that physical punishment is

implicitly excluded from "any form" due to her own (or the school's) definition of her role behavior.

Similarly, differences in inferential reasoning may bring about exasperated misunderstanding. Consider this familiar situation:

Teacher: Blake, I told you there is to be no talking during the examination. Please, hand in your paper.

Pupil: But, Sir, I only asked him for an eraser!

Teacher: I said there is going to be no talking.

Blake's reasoning could have gone something like this: the teacher said "no talking" because it is forbidden to exchange information during the test; but asking for an eraser is not cheating on the exam, hence that is permissible. The teacher's reasoning was, of course, something different: I don't want verbal interchange of any kind since I won't know whether they are asking for an eraser or exchanging information about the test. The older pupil who understands the teacher's reasoning would instead raise his hand and make the request of the teacher.

In the following example, two simultaneous conversations are recorded, the overt interchange and the very different internal verbalizations that accompany it:

Principal: Please sit down, John. I received a phone call this morning from Lester Wardaugh's father. (He must think my office is an awful mess. I know how particular he is about neatness.)

Teacher: Oh? What about? (Wardaugh is on the school board. He must have complained about something. I'm gonna get the treatment. Old Joe (the principal) is getting soft in his old age.

Principal: It's about our summer travel program. He thinks he can get the money for us, but there's a hitch.

(Wardaugh has always taken a lot of interest in our school. I hope he can convince the Washington people that our school could do a better job than Uni High. Too bad they decided to compete against us for the funds.)

Teacher: Actually, I've decided not to lead the group this summer. I'm going to enroll in summer school at the University.
(A hitch indeed! Wardaugh is furious at me for flunking his lazy son. I won't give good old Joe the pleasure of forcing me out.)

Principal: Gee, that's too bad, John. I understand your motives, but it puts me in kind of a pickle.
(What's eating him, anyway? He hates my guts for not being a pedantic S.O.B. like himself.)

Teacher: I'm sorry, Joe, but that degree is important to me. You know how it is.
(Actually, it would've been real nice to go to Europe. Mabel would've enjoyed it too. But I'm not gonna prostitute myself for Wardaugh. Lester wouldn't do a stitch of work all year.)

Principal: I understand, John. I'll think of something.
(With John out, Wardaugh will never get the money now! He had to conk out on me at the last moment!)

This may seem like an extreme example, but actually we have no data to assess the relative frequency with which misunderstandings of this sort occur in everyday life. The example shows how, within the context of a particular set, one may be led to formulate expectations and inferences leading to interpretations of the other's utterances that are totally different from those intended. In this case, the expectations and the drawn inferences are both role conditioned and personal (individual): Wardaugh, the school board member has certain powers that he can use to induce Joe, the principal, to act unfavorably against John, the teacher. (We shall consider some personal factors in greater detail below.)

It would appear, then, that one strategy which might prove useful in an attempt to improve communication in a particular

setting is to isolate the important role dyadic interactions that occur in that setting and to proceed with a detailed specification of the expectations and inferential behavior that are typical for them. One way of doing this is through analysis of real or hypothetical interchanges. For instance, a teacher and a principal can tape record some of their daily verbal interchanges and participate in the analysis done by the group as a whole. An additional method is to tape record a dyadic interchange produced by "role playing", in which one teacher, say, plays the role of a principal, and another that of a parent. "Role reversals" can point up sharply differences in background expectations such as, for instance, a teacher playing the role of a pupil and vice versa.

The number of role dyadic interactions in a school setting can be quite large: teacher-teacher, teacher-assistant teacher, teacher-principal, teacher-pupil, parent-teacher, etc., etc. It is not essential that every possible role dyad be analyzed. For one, some of these are less frequent and crucial than others, and their relative importance may vary for particular roles and individuals. For another, much of this kind of analytic activity can be done by the individual on his own, outside the group. What is important, is to develop the analytic attitude toward communicative acts, so that it can be used by the individual <u>when he chooses to do so</u>. This may seem a very artificial, ponderous, and cumbersome way of engaging in communicative acts, but the intention is not to eliminate spontaneity from communication, but, rather, to develop sensitivity in detecting inefficiencies in it. To achieve the latter goal, the individual must develop methods of obtaining

feedback from the interlocutor that would give him information about the other's assumptions, presuppositions, expectations, and inferences. Such information can then be used to clarify points of misunderstanding. Consider,for example, another version of the interchange between the principal and the teacher presented above. The original parts of the conversation are underlined to set them apart from the new material:

Principal: Please sit down, John. Sorry about the mess; it's been a hectic day.

Teacher: Oh, I know how it is.

Principal: I received a phone call this morning from Lester Wardaugh's father.

Teacher: Oh? What about? Lester hasn't been doing any work in my class. I suppose Wardaugh is unhappy about my flunking him.

Principal: Oh, it was nothing personal at all. He didn't even mention it. Anyway, this is something between you and Lester. It's about our summer travel program. He thinks he can get the money for us, but there's a hitch.

Teacher: Oh,oh! Wardaugh is on the school board, isn't he? Is he trying to put some pressure on you?

Principal: Oh, no, not at all. I mean, Uni High has decided to compete with us for the money, but Wardaugh is trying to convince the Washington people that we have better supervisory personnel.

Teacher: Actually, I have been thinking....

And so on. It is hard to believe that John would have persisted in his plans to withdraw from the program. What made the difference? Note that part of their previously internal verbalizations have now become overt, so that whatever "second guessing" each of them may have engaged in was largely corrected. Note also that the principal is careful to counteract the role

expectations that the teacher may have had about a school board member exercising improper influence.

At this point, one may ask what one can do to improve communication when the problem is not one of misunderstanding, but, rather, genuine disagreement about means, methods, and ends. While this question is also quite pertinent to an objective communication analysis, it touches more intimately on such psychological factors as attitudes, conflicts, perceived threat and insecurity, trust, ego strength, maturity, and the like, and it will be more conveniently handled in the next section, to which we now proceed.

The Encounter Process

An explanation of some event, process, phenomenon, etc. constitutes a set of statements or assertions arranged in some sequence whose structure follows certain rules. One important difference between "good" and "bad" explanations is that if we act upon the premises of the good one we are more likely to achieve some goal, such as change or control of other or similar events. To put it in reverse, an explanation that gives us that power of change and control is better than one that does not. There are numerous psychological explanations and theories about people, how and why they think and act in the way they do. We do not wish to get bogged down in polemics about which are the really "true" explanations. Let us simply agree that we shall accept as "working hypotheses" certain psychological accounts of communicative interactions, as long as they seem to give us the capability of changing and affecting communicative acts

in ways we deem desirable --- their "truth" or ultimate validity is of no concern.

Here, then, are a series of statements of a psychological nature that purport to describe how people may think, feel, and act in a role dyadic interaction. (Remember that here, as in previous analyses, it is not claimed that these are conscious, explicitly recognized processes.)

1. The Private-Public Dichotomy

(a) As a person, I consist of two parts: a private self which I feel consciously as the subject or actor of my thoughts and actions, and a public self, "me", of which others are aware.

(b) In the eyes of others, my private self, the "I" or ego is to be held responsible for the actions of my public self of which they are aware, the "me".

(c) Society (parents, friends, neighbors, colleagues, employers, "the law", etc.) has established certain rules to which people ought to conform. When my public self, the "me", conforms to these rules, the private self, the "I" which is responsible, is rewarded in various ways (money, praise, friendship, etc.). Similarly, when the "me" departs from these rules, the "I" is punished in various ways (imprisonment, social isolation, disapproval, etc.).

(d) If I am to maximize the rewards society has to offer, and minimize its punishments, "I" must put the best "me" forward.

Now, if these are indeed some major premises upon which an

individual acts in his mental and interpersonal behavior, there are certain consequences that will follow, which we ought to examine.

A. The Danger of Discovery. Any policy or strategy, which involves the "I" putting the best "me" forward, confronts the "I" with the ever present danger of being exposed as a fraud, with dire consequences (loss of acceptance and friendship, ostracism, retribution, etc.). The "I", therefore, labors under this constant stress and fear. For instance, if "me" is presented for others' benefit as religious, law-abiding, honest, genuine, friendly, loving, pure, compassionate, charitable, etc. while "deep down", the "I" knows that it isn't like that, it must always be watchful, be continually on its guard, lest others "see through" the "me" and withold the rewards for which the "I" craves. It follows, from this, that others become a source of threat; they are the "Inquisition". An impenetrable barrier is thus set up between oneself and others, whether the other be a stranger like the customs officer past whom one is trying to smuggle something, or an intimate like a spouse from whom one is trying to hide "selfish" thoughts and desires. True trust between two people can never develop as long as one is trying, through subterfuge, to "con" the other. In addition to the stress due to the danger of discovery, there is added the no lesser stress of loneliness, the feeling of being "by oneself", rather than "with another".

B. The Cancer of Guilt. If one looks more closely at the "I", one discovers that it too contains an internal barrier and is divided against itself. Freud popularized the three-way division of the "ego", "super-ego", and "id", standing respec-

tively for the self, the authority representative, and the biologically given urges. Religious spokesmen emphasized the "good" and the "evil" within us. Some psychologists speak of the "real ego" image versus the "ideal ego" image. However one chooses to conceptualize the divisiveness of the self, one is faced by the sad ravages wrought by the opposing forces within us: guilt, self-hatred, ambivalence, conflict, self-punishment, self-denial, etc.

It is important to realize that, so long as the individual is going to act consistently upon the premises outlined above (under statements a to d), there is no solution to the impasse: it is a classic instance of what psychologists have come to call "the double bind". The argument can be stated this way. Society sets up a distinction between the "I" and the "me". It furthermore sets up rules which govern how the "me" ought to be. The individual internalizes this division, and the system of differential rewards and punishment that is designed to insure its continuance. Now the individual is caught in a double bind of, "damned if you're right and damned if you're wrong", since if he plays society's game of putting the best "me" forward, he is confronted with guilt and self-condemnation, even though he minimizes the danger of discovery by being a good con-artist; on the other hand, if he tries to avoid the guilt of dupicity, by letting his true self show, society will punish him for not being as it prescribes one ought to be. The individual caught in this game-trap can never win. Is there no solution, then, to this impasse? There is, and we shall discuss it next.

C. The Ways of Liberation. There are essentially three solutions to the double bind which men have offered over the ages. Let us examine each in turn.

(i) The Way of the Straight Path. Man is born with "animal" instincts which, if allowed free expression, would destroy him. Society establishes rules of behavior designed to supress, counteract, and keep in check these destructive tendencies. "Conscience" is the internal censor-watchdog (whether God-given or created by society), and punishes infractions not externally detected by society. Neuroses are symptoms of the internal conflict between the animal urges fighting for expression and the counteraction of conscience trying to keep them in check. Guilt feelings, unhappiness, and the extremes of depression are caused by wayward actions, feelings, and thoughts. Three methods are recognized for handling these negative consequences. One is atonement and restitution for wrongdoing which gives the individual a reprieve and a next chance; a second is the strengthening of the "voice of conscience", through discipline and dedication, which allows the individual to resist temptations; and the third, much more recent in history, is that proposed by Freud and the psychoanalytic movement, which consists of weakening the unreasonable demands of a stern conscience run wild with power, and the greater acceptance of the biological urges within us --- a kind of midway solution, a practical compromise.

(ii) The Way of Self-Actualization. Man's instincts are not necessarily destructive, and can be channeled into ways which would satisfy both the individual and society. Various lines of thought exist, concerning which channel or channels

would lead to this mutually acceptable modus vivendi: finding and constructing "meaning" in life, actualizing our inner potentials, learning how to love oneself and others, etc. The various existential philosophies, and the motive-rationale behind the current "small group movement" (encounter, sensitivity, Gestalt therapy, etc.) concerned with ways of experiencing, can all be classified in this category. The emphasis has shifted from neurosis and guilt to "alienation" (from oneself, from human fellowship) or loneliness, which is attributed to the artificial creation by the socialized individual of a separation between how one really is and how one ought to be. The solution proposed is, then, abandoning notions of how one ought to be, and finding out how one really is, substituting the latter for the former as a goal of life. At the same time, it is asserted that being "how one really is" is not merely the only sane solution, but also that it is not inimical to a well functioning society.

(iii) The Awakening from the Illusion of the Social Game. This solution for the double bind is found in Eastern philosophies, especially in Zen Buddhism and Taoism. It is only recently that these ideas have come to be popularized in the West. There are many interpretations and versions of the "Eastern Ways of Liberation" and we shall discuss only one of these, as interpreted in the writings of Alan Watts.

The reality of the distinction between the "I" and the "me" is denied and is viewed as a social fiction, an illusion encouraged by society as a means of controlling the individual. The assertion of the existence of "I" as a cognizant, responsible subject-actor makes it possible for society to maintain

a system of differential rewards and punishment, both externally through social sanctions and internally through the "voice of the conscience". In fact, it is asserted, no such distinction exists, the "I" being an abstraction of the total "me", and indeed, of the environment and the world. The illusion of the "I" as an actor (and, hence, an agent to be held accountable and responsible for one's actions, feelings, and thoughts) is achieved by a deliberate repression of the total "me-environment", by ignoring it-- an act of "ignore-ance" as well as ignorance. Loneliness and alienation are not caused by an <u>actual</u> separation-- between the "I" and the "me", between the "me" and the "other", between life and death, but rather by the <u>illusion</u> of a separation, hence the way of liberation from this misery is to awaken to this subterfuge perpetrated by society, to realize it is illusory, not real. Unhappiness, the fear of death, the struggle between good and evil, the striving to be better, are paranoid constructions, and liberation from them comes about by realizing that they are illusions, not realities.

This philosophy, unlike the first two discussed, specifically denies the necessity of acting upon the major premises contained in statements a to d above. There is no solution to the double bind, so long as the "I"-"me" fiction is retained. Guilt is not possible, if there is no "I" to be held responsible for what the organism <u>is</u> (does, thinks, feels, are terms which necessarily retain the actor-action dichotomy).

There is a likely misinterpretation of this position which ought to be dispelled. The solution to the double bind here offered is not to be equated with the Western scientific pre-

mise of "determinism" or other Eastern philosophies of "fatalism". On the surface, there are points of similarity. Determinism views the organism as a machine (in the formal, mathematical sense) controlled ("programmed") by environmental contingencies interacting with biological structures and properties; it thus denies "free will", "consciousness", and the like, treating these as "mental" fictions. Fatalism is the mystical belief in a pre-ordained order, which individual choice and decision making cannot affect or change. On the other hand, the Zen Buddhist and Taoist metaphysics denies the validity of such dichotomies as "determinism" versus "free will", "pre-ordained order" versus "individual choice". The concept of determinism makes sense only in conjunction with or in contradistinction to the concept of "free will": in effect, one must first accept the <u>possibility</u> of the actor-action model of the "free will" hypothesis before one can reject it in favor of the deterministic hypothesis. But in Zen Buddhism and Taoism, the actor-agent model is not accepted as meaningful, relevant, hence possible; it is seen as a pseudo-question, and consequently, the determinism-free will issue never arises.

It is for this reason that if everyone became "liberated", the world and society wouldn't suddenly and drastically change, since the world and society already are the way they are, not by anyone's "doing", but because they cannot be what they are not. Society is not an "artificial" system set up against nature; it is part of nature. Sanctions that men "set up" to "control" each other are not "artificial" rules to thwart "natural" urges, they are part of man's environ-

ment, and they will, of course, continue that way; otherwise, they wouldn't exist in the first place. The only essential difference between the "liberated one" and those who are not, is their attitude -- toward the self/environment dichotomy, the paranoia "against" death, the illusion of alienation, the fiction of the "I" as the house divided against itself. This difference in attitude will certainly make a difference, since men who labor under the illusion that they are unhappy and alienated have neurotic symptoms and are at war with themselves, their fellow men and the world. Men who do not have this fiction cannot have neurotic symptoms, and cannot be at war. It is, thus, not a question of choice, but a statement of what is.

This third interpretation of the ways of liberation from the double bind is more abstract and general than the first two, the latter being subsumed under it. For practical purposes, it would seem better for the individual to adopt one of them, or some version of it, as a working hypothesis upon which he can act consistently, than to wait for a theoretical resolution. Whichever interpretation is adopted, it will enable the individual to become more analytic about his interpersonal interactions. Furthermore, even if we wish to assume that if one interpretation is correct, the others must be wrong, it is still possible that acting consistently on any one of the interpretations may lead to improvement in one's relationships with others; and, in addition, it provides the individual with further evidence upon which to make future choices.

What does it mean "to act consistently and analytically" on some premise or interpretation? Another way of putting it is to say that the individual must be explicitly aware of his situation, psychical as well as interpersonal. For instance, what is the nature of the social game he is playing with others, or with a particular individual? What kind of a contractual arrangement does he have? What are the rules that govern his interactions? This kind of analysis can reveal the self-contradictory nature of many of our activities, and while such revelation does not necessarily enable one to change, it would seem to be a precondition for it, and in addition, such a realization may reduce the distress that accompanies the feeling of being moved by blind forces.

Let us take a concrete illustration of a problem suggested by the discussion in the Introduction. A teacher may genuinely and firmly believe that bilingual education should be used as a means of acculturation, given the fact that her Spanish-speaking pupils are going to grow up to be in the American scene, and, hence, must adopt white, middle class standards, if they are going to be successful in life. She is encountering a great deal of trouble in her task: the pupils show no real desire to learn English beyond certain rudiments of everyday commonplace communication; they show no real progress in reading and writing; their interest in history and arithmetic is slight; they do spotty homework; they are unenthusiastic and unfriendly; they show no real ambition to achieve and get ahead. She has tried being friendly and "understanding"; she learned to be fluent in Spanish, and even paid a few good will visits to the homes of some of her pupils. But, year

after year, the fruits of her teaching remain very modest and unsatisfactory. She has reached a frustrating and incomprehensible impasse. What can she do?

The first step in an analytic approach is to examine objectively the premises upon which she is acting. She may begin with the background assumptions and presuppositions of three of her central concepts --- the American scene, middle class standards, being successful in life --- and the inferential reasoning that links them into a proposition : (a) they are going to grow up in the American scene; (b) given the fact that one is going to grow up in the American scene, it follows, therefore, that he must adopt middle class values; (c) to be successful in life, one must adopt middle class values.

Having made this analysis, which we are not going to do here, the next step is to get feedback from her pupils to see what their premises are about these issues. Two possibilities now arise: (a) her pupils share the same premises, or (b) her pupils do not share the same premises, and presumably, she can now identify the important differences.

If the case is (a), she now must examine whether her interactions with the pupils are interpreted by them in the same way as she interprets them, namely that what she does in the classroom and outside is designed to and does contribute to the objectives of their shared premises. If their interpretation is different, or if alternative (b) is the case, then she is going to realize in a more profound way than she has until then, why it is that her teaching has re-

mained unsuccessful. On the basis of this knowledge, she can introduce some changes into her activities, specifically designed as corrective measures.

Suppose, for instance, that José figures it this way: "I cannot become a true North American unless I think and act like one. If I do, my family and friends will consider me strange, and I am going to lose them. O.K. But, now, if I try to really become a North American, like my cousin, Pedro, and maybe even marry an American girl and live in an American neighborhood, they're not going to accept me, 'cause my name is Spanish, my skin is dark, my family lives in the slums, etc. So, where will I be? Nowhere! That's not for me! Teach is not going to make an American out of me. The hell with school! I'm gonna go work and have fun with the boys."

And suppose Ramirez figures it this way: "It would be a good idea to do well in school, graduate, and get a good job, and make more money than José, and live in a bigger house, and have a new car. But, why do I need to know all that stuff about American history and that poetry stuff, and write all those compositions in English. Ugh! And, Teach isn't interested in us anyway. She pretends to talk like us; her Spanish is pretty good, actually, but then she wouldn't even give Rogelio a good strapping for coming late every day. She doesn't give a damn! If I could only graduate without having to do all that homework, and get a good job, and....."

Writing hypothetical accounts such as these is itself a good exercise for showing up one's misunderstandings or ignorance of the other. In this case, the present writer's own misconceptions would be shown up by having "José" and "Ramirez"

and "Rogelio" and "Pedro" comment on them.

Continuing in this vein, the teacher would now set up new and clarified contractual arrangements between herself and her pupils, or Spanish assistant teacher, or teacher colleague, or principal, or parents. The content of these new "contracts" would depend on her needs, values, wishes, as well as those of the other party. She may not wish or be able to become bicultural herself, in which case, she cannot make her pupils bicultural and achieve bicultural communication with them, but as long as her relationship with the other is clarified and does not masquerade under false pretenses, the two parties can still perceive each other as being of mutual benefit, within the limits of the contract. People can tolerate differences for the sake of mutual interest, so long as the arrangement is clearly recognized and entered into <u>voluntarily</u>. In the absence of both explicitness and voluntary participation, such interaction is tainted by mistrust and perceived as manipulation or subversion.

The setting up of new, explicit, and voluntary contracts requires honesty and equality. The two are preconditions for building trust. Honesty involves analytic self-examination as well as risk-taking, for if one isn't honest with oneself, the other person, not knowing which of your actions and feelings are deliberate and which are "unconscious", will interpret contradictions as dishonest intent and dissimulation. Equality presupposes respect and acceptance, and the realization that most of the values we so dearly cherish are culturally given, not immutable truths of nature. This realization, in turn, presupposes an analytic understanding of

our concept of the self, our knowledge of the nature of guilt, our definition of what constitutes responsibility, and the ultimate metaphysics to which we unconsciously subscribe. And, here, we have come full circle, back to the "Ways of Liberation" and the double bind in which we find ourselves. From the objective methods and language of the communication model, we are led back to a highly subjective metaphysics, which, in turn, leads us to an examination of our everyday actions and feelings, and back again to the underlying philosophy, within which we embed our analysis of contractual arrangements and interpersonal behavior. The ECW is a program that takes the individual and the group repeatedly through this cyclical loop.

Overview

Two different approaches have previously been used in the study of human communication. On the one hand, academic displines such as psychology, linguistics, and anthropology have given us a tradition of "objective analyses" and a formalized language of theory, within which hypotheses are formulated and checked against certain empirical consequences, using the "scientific" or experimental method. On the other hand, sensitivity training laboratories and basic encounter groups also deal with the problem of communication, both with the self and the other, but from a very different perspective; emphasis is placed on the subjective aspects of experiencing the communication as an interpersonal transaction of feelings, agreements and disagreements, sympathy, support, hostility, threat, trust, and the like. Traditionally, these two approaches to communication have not only remained distinct and separate, but they were seen as mutually exclusive and incompatible. The "scientific" method did not admit concepts that had no objectively definable parameters, and excluded from its input evidence that was not observable under "controlled" conditions. Those concerned with feelings and experiencing, felt constrained and frustrated under the requirements imposed by the experimental method. "Two cultures" of discourse and activity have, thus, developed in recent years, each viewing the other with mistrust and suspicion. The encounter-communication

workshop (ECW) is conceived as a "third culture" activity, different from the other two, yet drawing upon both. The three words in this expression encapsulize its focus and method: "encounter" reflects the fact that a different social contract (see below) defines the interpersonal behavior of the group participants; "communication" not only represents the main concern of the study program, its content and focus, but draws attention to the process itself, which includes a new way of being present to others, of communicating with them; "workshop" is intended as a distinguishing feature from "course" or "seminar", and is a way of emphasizing the self-exploratory and participatory nature of the activity.

Some explanation is in order as to the meaning of social contract as used here. All transactions between people are governed by some set of rules or regulations, either recognized or implicit, that may be called the social contract. Everyday commonplace conversation takes place within the context of such participatory rules that specify such things as what one may talk about, in what way, and under which circumstances. For instance, the extent to which one overtly renders internal verbalizations depends on the formality level of the interaction (how intimately the conversants know each other, whether other listeners are present, etc.) and the degree of risk-taking they are ready to engage in (how much they trust each other, whether they are engaged in cooperation or competition, etc.). In sensitivity and encounter groups, a "cultural island" is established, in which the social contract governing interactions is made explicitly

different from "the outside" of everyday life: honesty is mandatory, feelings must be expressed, self-disclosure is encouraged, growth producing confrontations are attempted, nonverbal physical contact is deliberately engaged in, and so forth. The success of the group experience is defined in terms of the extent to which the individual develops the capacity to relate to others in the group, in the ways specified by the "artificial" social contract. In the encounter-communication workshop, no specific social contract is set forth as the "desirable" way of interacting and toward which the individual is supposed to aspire for his interpersonal growth. Instead, the participants are encouraged to explore interpersonal transactions under various social contract obligations as defined by role dyads. To do so, they must first learn how to identify in explicit terms the sets of rules that define a particular role dyadic interaction as experienced in their daily lives. Once this is successfully accomplished, they can then experiment with changes in some of the specific rules. For instance, a teacher might wish at one time to decrease the formality level that characterizes his typical interaction with the principal and, at another time, he might wish to <u>increase</u> the formality level of his typical interaction with a teacher-aide. In the former case, greater expression of feelings will take place; in the latter case, less intimacy is wished. The success of the encounter-communication workshop will be measured, not by the capacity to adhere to any specified social contract, but by the extent to which the individual comes to develop the ability to bring about desired changes in some specified

aspect of an existing relationship outside the workshop. The special and artificial contract in the ECW derives from the fact that it makes possible such exploratory activity, without the usual social consequences that accompany such activities outside the group. It is for this reason that the participants in such a workshop should be made up of those individuals who are normally engaged in role dyadic interactions on the outside (such as the school setting). Under normal circumstances, the risks involved in such exploration between co-workers would be too prohibitive.

Readings

The following sources are suggested for background reading in preparation for, and in conjunction with an ECW program dealing with bicultural communication in the school setting:

Bales, R.F. Personality and Interpersonal Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.

Egan, Gerald. Encounter: Group Processes for Interpersonal Growth. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole (Wadsworth), 1970.

Ellis, Albert and Harper, R.A. A Guide to Rational Living. Hollywood, Calif.: Wilshire Book Co., 1961 (8721 Sunset Blvd). (Also available from the Institute for Rational Living, 45 E. 65th St., N.Y. 10021).

Fromm, Erich. The Art of Loving. New York: Harper & Row (Harper Colophon), 1962.

Garfinkel, Harold. Studies in Ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

Goffman, Erving. Interaction Ritual. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Anchor Books, 1967.

Jakobovits, L.A. (a) Foreign Language Learning. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, 1970. (b) Prolegomena to a Theory of Communication Competence. Chilton Books, 1970. (Available from the author.) (c) The Dynamics of Integrity Groups: A subjective account. (Available from the author.)

Kochman, Thomas. Black English in the Classroom. Department of Linguistics, Northeastern Illinois State College, Oct. 1969 (Mimeo.)

Lambert, W.E. A Social Psychology of Bilingalism. The Journal of Social Issues, 23, 1967, 91-109. (And other articles in that issue.)

Rogers, C.R. Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1969.

Schutz, W.C. Joy. New York: Grove Press, 1967.

Searle, J.R. Speech Acts. Cambridge, England and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Shuy, R.W. (General Editor: Urban Language Series). Washington, D.C. : Center for Applied Linguistics. (Several books of interest.)

Smith, A.G. (Ed.) Communication and Culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1966.

Tyler,S.A. (Ed.) Cognitive Anthropology. New York: Hart, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.

Watts, A.W. Psychotherapy East & West. New York: Ballantine Books, 1969.

References

Bereiter, Carl and Engelmann, Siegfried. Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Preschool. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Kochman, Thomas. Black English in the Classroom. Department of Linguistics, Northeastern Illinois State College, Oct., 1969. (Mimeo).

Lambert, W.E. A Social Psychology of Bilingualism. The Journal of Social Issues, 23, 1967, 91-109.